I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: June 4, 2010 Signature: /David A. Gass #38,153/ (David A. Gass)

Docket No.: 28079/41333

(PATENT)

### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Kenneth Barton

Application No.: 07/827,906

Filed: January 30, 1992

For: Improved Expression of Genes in Plants

Confirmation No.: 3375

Art Unit: 1638

Examiner: Anne R. Kubelik

### **RESUBMISSION OF PETITION TO EXPUNGE**

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper pertains to a petition to expunge documents from the record of the aboveidentified application.

Amendments: None

Remarks begin on page 2 of this paper.

Appended hereto are copies of the petition and supporting documents as previously filed, and copies of the Office's previous decision dismissing the petition with invitation to resubmit.

No fee is believed to be due with this paper. However, the Office is authorized to charge any necessary and unpaid fees to Marshall Gerstein & Borun LLP Deposit Account Number 13-2855, under order number 28079/41333.

### **REMARKS**

### BACKGROUND

Applicants previously filed a petition to expunge dated February 9, 2009 (entered into the record on February 10, 2009). (Exhibit A) The petition requested that certain documents that were filed under seal as part of information disclosure statement submissions be expunged if the documents were found not to be important to a reasonable examiner in deciding whether to allow the application to issue as a patent. (See petitions.) In Petition Decisions dated February 13, 2009 (Exhibit B), the Office dismissed the petition as premature, and invited Applicants to resubmit the petition subsequent to issuance of a Notice of Allowability. The petition decision specified that no further petition fee would be due at such time.

The application has been permitted to lapse for reasons unrelated to the material cited in the Information Disclosure Statement, and no continuing cases are pending.

### REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Because the application has now lapsed, the petition to expunge is now believed to be timely, and Applicants request favorable reconsideration of the petition at this time. The Office is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if a telephonic discussion would facilitate consideration of the petitions.

Dated: June 4, 2010 Respectfully submitted,

By /David A. Gass #38,153/
David A. Gass (Reg. No. 38,153)
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant

# EXHIBIT A

Docket No.: 28079/41333

(PATENT)

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Barton et al. Confirmation No.: 3375

Application No.: 07/827,906 Group Art Unit: 1638

Filed: January 30, 1992 Examiner: A. R. Kubelik

For: IMPROVED EXPRESSION OF GENES IN

**PLANTS** 

# PETITION TO EXPUNGE PAPERS FROM FILE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.59 (MPEP 724.05)

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attn: TC1600

Dear Madam:

The applicants hereby identify the following Documents filed as part of the accompanying Information Disclosure Statement ("IDS", copy of transmittal letter and complete list of documents attached hereto) as the subject of this conditional petition to expunge pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.59.

Litigation	Documents Subject to Protective Order
(1) Mycogen Corp. v. Monsanto Co., 1:04-CV-	C4 - C13.
0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern	
District of Indiana, filed March 30, 2004.	
(2) Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc.,	C18-C24; C32 -C33; C38-C40; C42-
96-133-RRM, U.S. District Court for the District of	C44; C51-C55; C156-C170.
Delaware, filed March 19, 1996.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
(3) Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.,	C173; C191- C194.
950653J (LSP), U.S. District Court for the Southern	
District of California, filed May 19, 1995.	
(4) Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.	C198-C202; C208-C211; C214-C225;
et al., 96-505-RRM, U.S. District Court for the	C228-C232; C305.
District of Delaware, filed October 22, 1996.	0202, 0303.

The Documents to be expunged, listed in the table above, are subject to one or more protective orders, as explained in the IDS, and have not otherwise been made public. The documents have been packaged and labeled in accordance with MPEP 724.02.

The Applicants commit to retain the Documents for the period of any patent issued on the above-mentioned application with regard to which the Documents are presently submitted.

The petition to expunge is being submitted by (on behalf of) the party in interest, Monsanto Company, St. Louis, MO, who originally caused the Documents to be submitted.

The Commissioner is therefore petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.59 to expunge the Documents IF THE DOCUMENTS ARE FOUND NOT TO BE IMPORTANT TO A REASONABLE EXAMINER IN DECIDING WHETHER TO ALLOW THE APPLICATION TO ISSUE AS A PATENT. The Applicants request that the evaluation of the importance of each document (and whether it may properly be expunged) be made individually. Applicants understand that this petition will be held in abeyance until the close of prosecution on the merits (MPEP 724.05 (I) and 724.06).

The fee for this petition in the amount of \$200.00 according to 37 C.F.R. 1.17(g) may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 28079/41333.

Dated: February 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

David A. Gass

Registration No.: 38,153

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicants

Docket No.: 28079/41333

(PATENT)

### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: Kenneth A. Barton et al.

Application No.: 07/827,906 Confirmation No.: 3375

Filed: January 30, 1992 Art Unit: 1638

For: IMPROVED EXPRESSION OF GENES IN Examiner: A. R. Kubelik

PLANTS

### INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT WITH DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL

MS Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants request that this Information Disclosure Statement be entered and considered by the examiner during the prosecution of this application and that the references be made of record therein (except as noted in the next paragraph).

A copy of each listed document is filed herewith, although many of the enclosed documents are being submitted under seal with the labels appended hereto. Some of the documents in this Information Disclosure Statement are subject to protective orders entered in prior litigations and are being submitted under seal for consideration by the Examiner under MPEP § 724, without scanning or publication by the USPTO. These documents are labeled in accordance with MPEP § 724.02 and are identified in the table below. Applicants also submit a petition and fee under 37 CFR § 1.59, requesting that these documents be expunged from the file.

Litigation	Documents Subject to Protective Order
(1) Mycogen Corp. v. Monsanto Co., 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, filed March 30, 2004.	C4 - C13.
(2) Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., 96-133-RRM, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, filed March 19, 1996.	C18 - C24; C32 - C33; C38 - C40; C42 - C44; C51-C55; C156 - C170.
(3) Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co., 950653J (LSP), U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, filed May 19, 1995.	C173; C191- C194.
(4) Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co. et al., 96-505-RRM, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, filed October 22, 1996.	C198-C202; C208-C211; C214-C225; C228- C232; C305

The documents in this Information Disclosure Statement originate from four separate litigations which may be viewed as related to the subject matter for which a patent is being sought on the above identified application. Such submission is made in accordance with MPEP §2001.06 (c) and 37 CFR §§1.56, 1.97, and 1.98, and should not be construed as a representation that a search has been made or as an admission that the information cited is, or is considered to be, material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR § 1.56(b). A general overview of these prior litigations is provided below for the Examiner's convenience. Should the Examiner have questions regarding these litigations, the undersigned attorney would be happy to attempt to provide answers.

(1) Mycogen Corp. v. Monsanto Co., 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, filed March 30, 2004. Documents C1 to C14 are from this litigation. Mycogen filed suit against Monsanto pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 146 for dissatisfaction with the Final Decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for Patent Interference No. 103,781 ("the '781 Interference") (C1: Exhibit A). The patent and applications involved in the interference were (a) U.S.S.N. 08/434,105, filed May 3, 1995, a pending application of inventors David Fischhoff *et al.*; (b) U.S. Application No. 07/827,906 of inventors Barton *et al.*, filed Jan. 30, 1992 (the present application); and (c) U.S. Patent No. 5,380,831 ("the '831 patent") of inventors Adang *et al.*, filed May 3, 1993. The complaint is document C1, Monsanto's answer is C2, and Mycogen's reply is C3.

The interference was eventually defined by the following "Count 2": (a) any one of claims 3, 5, 39, and 40 of Fischhoff et al.'s application 08/434,105, filed May 3, 1995, (b) any one of claims 1-4, 7, and 15-22 of Barton et al.'s application 07/827,906, filed January 30, 1992, and (c) any one of claims 1-12 of Adang et al.'s '831 patent (C1: Exhibit A at 194). As common owner of the Fischhoff and Barton applications, Monsanto elected Fischhoff as the first to invent the subject matter of Count 2 (C1: Exhibit A at 54). Thereafter, the Board granted priority to Fischhoff over Adang based upon findings that Fischhoff had a prior conception and reduction to practice and that Adang was not diligent in their reduction to practice (C1: Exhibit A at 2). The Board also held that Barton et al. were not entitled to a patent containing claims 1-12 of the '831 patent.

During the § 146 action, Mycogen asserted various dates of conception and reduction to practice for Barton and Adang regarding the inventive subject matter of Count 2 and the invention of modifying the coding sequence of a Bt gene to reduce the number of polyadenylation signals and ATTTA nucleotide sequences in the coding sequence (C4 at 9-14). Monsanto also asserted various dates of conception and reduction to practice for Barton and Fischhoff regarding the subject matter of Count 2 and the invention of modifying the coding sequence of a Bt gene to reduce the number of polyadenylation signals and ATTTA nucleotide sequences in the coding sequence (C5 at 6-11).

Monsanto also responded that it was dissatisfied with certain findings of the Board, including the Board's finding that Fischhoff was not entitled to a conception date of October 30, 1986 (C5 at 3-6). Monsanto proffered expert reports by Mr. John Goolkasian and Dr. Joachim Messing to address these issues (C6, C7, C9). Mycogen proffered expert reports by Dr. Joseph Falkinham to address these issues (C8, C10). Monsanto also filed a motion for summary judgment that Fischhoff was the first to invent the subject matter of Count 2 (C11; Opposition at C12; Reply at C13). The Court also issued an opinion as to certain pending motions (C14). Monsanto and Mycogen discovery responses addressing these issues are provided as documents C4-C5.

Monsanto and Mycogen settled the § 146 action before final adjudication. This resulted in Mycogen withdrawing its allegations of prior invention by Barton and Adang, thus leaving intact the Board's grant of prior invention to Fischhoff over Adang regarding Count 2.

Litigations (3) and (4), described below, also relate to Mycogen's U.S. Patent No. 5,380,831.

(2) Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., 96-133-RRM, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, filed March 19, 1996. Documents C15 to C170 are from this litigation. This litigation related to U.S. Patent No. 5,500,365 ("the '365 patent") which issued from a divisional application of Fishchhoff et al., U.S.S.N. 08/434,105. In this litigation, Monsanto asserted that Mycogen Plant Science, Agrigenetics, and Ciba-Geigy had infringed the '365 patent by making, using, and/or selling corn products containing Event 176, a trait directed to conferring resistance to insects.

Prior art asserted by Ciba and Mycogen is included in their notices under 35 U.S.C. § 282 (C15-17). Interrogatory responses related to the parties invalidity contentions are documents C18-C24.

Expert reports were also submitted by the parties on the litigated issues, including those found at C156-C170. Expert reports proffered by Monsanto included reports by Nam-Hai Chua (C169-C170) and John Goolkasian (C166-C167). Expert reports by Mycogen included reports by Lawrence Bogorad (C161), Michael Adang (C156), and Joseph Falkinham (C163-C165). Expert reports by Novartis included reports Arthur Aronson (C157), Julia Bailey-Serres (C158, C168), and John Dewhirst (C162).

The defendants filed various summary judgment motions. Ciba-Geigy moved for summary judgment of invalidity based on prior inventorship under 35 U.S.C. § 102(g) ((C38); Monsanto Opposition (C39); Ciba Reply (C40)). Mycogen moved for summary judgment of invalidity based on obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 ((C41-C42); Monsanto Opposition (C43); Mycogen Reply (C44)). Mycogen and Ciba-Geigy filed a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) for failure to comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 ((C45-47); Monsanto Opposition (C48); Reply (C49)). A court hearing was held, in part, on this motion (C37). The motion was denied (C50). Ciba-Geigy and Mycogen filed summary judgment motions asserting that the '365 patent was invalid for lack of written description under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ((C51, C52); Monsanto Opposition (C53); Ciba-Geigy and Mycogen Replies (C54 and C55)).

A jury trial was held on issues of infringement and invalidity. Trial transcripts that may be viewed as relevant to the subject matter for which a patent is sought on the above application may be found as documents C61-C155. Included in the transcripts are testimony

by inventors Fischhoff (C91, C129-132) and Perlak (C89, C95, C110-113). Testimony by alleged prior inventors Barton and Miller may be found as documents C82, C86, and C88. Expert testimony introduced by Monsanto included Nam-Hai Chua (C76-C81, C109, C135-6) and John Goolkasian (C71-75, C166-7). Expert testimony introduced by Mycogen included Lawrence Bogorad (C146-8); Michael Adang (C99-101); and Joseph Falkinham (C106-8). Expert testimony introduced by Novartis included Julia Bailey-Serres (C92-4) and John Dewhirst (C83-5).

The jury found that the asserted claims (claims 7, 8, 9, and 12) were literally infringed, but that the accused products were so far changed from the principle of the claimed invention that they did not infringe under the reverse doctrine of equivalents (C59 at 5). The jury also found that the asserted claims were invalid because of prior invention by scientists at Agracetus, Barton and Miller (C59 at 5). The Court later held a bench trial regarding whether the '365 patent was unenforceable due to alleged inequitable conduct by Monsanto (C59 at 5). Fischhoff also testified during the bench trial (C149-152).

All of the parties requested judgment as a matter of law (JMOL) after trial on various issues. Monsanto's JMOL briefing on non-infringement under the reverse doctrine of equivalents and invalidity by prior invention may be found as documents C25, C29, and C36, with opposition briefing as documents C32 and C33. Mycogen's and Novartis' JMOL briefing on invalidity due to lack of written description, indefiniteness, and obviousness may be found as documents C26-28, C30, and C34-35, with opposition briefing as document C31.

The Court issued an opinion on the JMOL's and inequitable conduct (C58, C59). The Court denied Monsanto's JMOL on invalidity for prior invention (C59 at 101-115). Specifically, the Court found that while Fischhoff reduced the asserted claims to practice before Barton and Miller (C59 at 106-111), the jury could have found that Barton and Miller conceived first and were diligent in reducing to practice (C59 at 111-115). The Court found in favor of Monsanto on the issue of infringement under the reverse doctrine of equivalents and entered judgment as a matter of law for Monsanto on the issue (C59 at 115-121). The Court denied Mycogen's and Novartis' JMOL's on invalidity due to lack of written description (C59 at 121-127), indefiniteness (C59 at 128-130), and obviousness (C59 at 130-132). The Court also found that Monsanto had not committed inequitable conduct during prosecution of the '365 patent (C59 at 136-148). The result of the Court's opinion was that

the defendants were found to have infringed the asserted claims of the '365 patent, but these claims were invalid based on prior invention by Barton and Miller.

Monsanto appealed to the Federal Circuit regarding prior invention by Barton and Miller (C60). The Federal Circuit upheld the district court's decision and affirmed in favor of the defendants on the issue (C60 at 12).

(3) Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co., 950653J (LSP), U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, filed May 19, 1995. Documents C171 to C194 are from this litigation. In this litigation, Mycogen asserted that Monsanto had willfully infringed Adang's '831 patent by making, using, and/or selling products containing Monsanto's BollGard® cotton gene, Monsanto's YieldGard® corn gene, Monsanto's NewLeaf® potato gene, Northrup King Bt 11 event gene, or the Stoneville cotton gene. In response, Monsanto asserted, inter alia, that Monsanto scientists Fred Perlak and David Fischhoff invented the claimed invention of the '831 patent prior to Mycogen. (The '831 patent was also the subject of the '781 Interference described above.)

Monsanto proffered expert reports by Mr. John Goolkasian, Mr. Dallas Johnson, and Dr. Joachim Messing (C191, C192, C193). Mycogen proffered an expert report by Dr. Joseph Falkinham (C194). Interrogatory responses are provided as documents C171-173.

On December 28, 1995, Mycogen moved for summary judgment of validity of the '831 patent claims ((C174-175); Monsanto's Opposition (C176), Mycogen's Reply (C177)). In denying Mycogen's motion, the Court declined to "make a ruling that Monsanto has failed to establish the invalidity of Mycogen's patent" (C178 at 3).

Sometime later, on March 30, 1998, Monsanto moved for summary judgment of invalidity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(g) and 103 ((C179); Mycogen's Opposition (C180); Monsanto's Reply (C181)). Monsanto further moved for summary judgment that the '831 patent claims were invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ((C182); Mycogen's Opposition (C183); Monsanto's Reply (C184)). Following oral arguments on the summary judgment motions, the Court stayed the proceedings until the post-trial motions in the related case in Delaware were complete (see section (4) below). On September 8, 1999, following rulings on these motions in Delaware, the Court lifted the stay and granted Monsanto's motion for summary judgment pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(g) and 103 (C185). The Court denied Monsanto's motion for summary judgment under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as moot. See C185.

These decisions were appealed to the Federal Circuit. Upon reviewing the district court's prior invention determination, the Federal Circuit concluded that summary judgment was improper because fact issues remained to be resolved on the issue of prior inventorship. C186 (Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co., 252 F.3d 1306, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2001). The Federal Circuit declined to rule on Monsanto's motion for summary judgment of invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 112, leaving it to the district court to resolve in the first instance. Mycogen Plant Science, 252 F.3d at 1317.

Following the Federal Circuit decision, Monsanto renewed its motion for summary judgment of invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (C187, Mycogen's Opposition at C188, Monsanto's Reply at C189). The Court denied Monsanto's motion on June 4, 2002 (C190). Subsequently, Mycogen dismissed all pending claims with prejudice.

(4) Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co. et al., 96-505-RRM, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, filed October 22, 1996. Documents C195 to C305 are from this litigation. This litigation related to patents issuing from continuing applications of Adang's '831 patent—specifically, U.S. Patent Nos. 5,567,600 ("the '600 patent") and 5,567,862 ("the '862 patent). In this litigation, Mycogen asserted that Monsanto had willfully infringed the '600 and '862 patents by making, using, and/or selling products containing Monsanto's BollGard® cotton gene, Monsanto's YieldGard® corn gene, Monsanto's NewLeaf® potato gene, Northrup King Bt 11 event gene, or the Stoneville cotton gene. Monsanto asserted, *inter alia*, that Monsanto scientists Fred Perlak and David Fischhoff invented the claimed invention of the '600 and '862 patents prior to the Mycogen inventors. In response to that allegation, Mycogen further asserted that Monsanto had derived the subject matter claimed in the '600 and '862 patents from Mycogen.

Prior art asserted by Monsanto and Delta and Pine Land Company and by DeKalb Genetics are included in their notices under 35 U.S.C. § 282 (C195-196). Interrogatory responses are at C197-202. Monsanto also proffered expert reports on the litigated issues by Mr. Donald Banner, Mr. Dallas Johnson, and Dr. Joachim Messing (C228, C229, C230 respectively). Mycogen proffered expert reports by Mr. Lawrence Bogorad and Dr. Joseph Falkinham (C231, C232).

Prior to trial, Monsanto filed a summary judgment motion of invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 102(g) asserting that Mycogen was not the first to invent the subject matter of the '862 and '600 patents ((C214, C216 (amended)); Mycogen's Opposition (C215); Monsanto's

Reply (C217)). Monsanto also filed a summary judgment motion of invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 112 asserting that the '862 and '600 patents failed to satisfy the enablement requirement and would require undue experimentation in order to practice the claimed invention ((C218), Mycogen's Opposition (C219-220); Monsanto's Reply (C221)). Codefendant DeKalb Genetics Corp. filed its summary judgment motion of invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 112, asserting that the '862 and '600 patents failed to satisfy the enablement requirement ((C222); Mycogen's Opposition (C223-224); DeKalb's Reply (C225)). Letters addressed to the Court regarding the above summary judgment motions are included as documents C212-213. The district court judge did not grant any of these motions.

A jury trial was held on issues of infringement and invalidity. Trial transcripts that may be viewed as relevant to the subject matter for which a patent is sought on the above application may be found as documents C234 to C304. Included within the trial transcripts are testimony by both Elizabeth Murray (C237 to C241) and Michael Adang (C277 to C280) and Mycogen experts Mr. Lawrence Bogorad and Dr. Joseph Falkinham (C273 to C276). Also included within the trial transcripts are testimony by Monsanto scientists Fred Perlak (C242 to C244) and David Fischhoff (C256 to C258) as well as testimony by Monsanto expert Dr. Joachim Messing (C259, C260).

The jury found that the claimed invention of the '600 and '862 patents were invalid due to prior invention by Monsanto and entered a "N/A" as to the remaining invalidity issues (C226 at 10-12). The Delaware court entered a judgment declaring that the '600 and '862 patents were invalid based upon the jury's determination that Monsanto was the first to invent the technology underlying those patents. *See* C226. All parties moved for judgment as a matter of law (JMOL) on various issues following entry of the judgment. Mycogen moved for JMOL on the issues of prior inventorship and obviousness and moved for a new trial ((C203, C204); Monsanto's Opposition (C205); DeKalb's Opposition (C206); Mycogen's Reply (C207)). Monsanto moved for JMOL on invalidity based on prior invention and invalidity due to lack of enablement as well as indefiniteness ((C208, C209, C210); Mycogen's Opposition (C305); Monsanto's Reply (C211)).

The Court issued an opinion on the JMOL motions (C227) which denied Mycogen's motion for JMOL and granted Monsanto's motion for JMOL holding that the claims of the '600 and '862 patents were invalid for lack of enablement.

On appeal, the Federal Circuit affirmed the jury's verdict of invalidity based upon prior invention pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(g). See C233. It found that this rendered a ruling on the district court's grant of Monsanto's JMOL of lack of enablement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, unnecessary (C233).

This Information Disclosure Statement is filed after the mailing date of the first Office Action on the merits, but before the mailing date of a Final Office Action or Notice of Allowance (37 CFR 1.97(c)). Accordingly, our check in the amount of \$180.00 covering the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) is enclosed. Should any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 to 1.21 be required for any reason relating to the enclosed materials, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct said fees from our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 28079/41333.

Dated: February 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

David A. Gass

Registration No.: 38,153

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

Alus

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant

Substitute for for	m 1449/P10	

## INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

(Use as many sheets as necessary)

1	of	23

Complete if Known					
07/827,906-Conf. #3375					
January 30, 1992					
Kenneth A. Barton					
1638					
A. R. Kubelik					
28079/41333					

ļ	U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
Examiner Initials*	Cite No.1		Publication Date	Name of Potentia	Pages, Columns, Lines, Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear		
L	, guica Appear						

	FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS							
Examiner Initials*	Cite No. <sup>1</sup>	Foreign Patent Document  Country Code <sup>3</sup> -Number <sup>4</sup> -Kind Code <sup>5</sup> (# known)	Publication	Name of Patentee or	Pages, Columns, Lines, Where Relevant Passages Or Relevant Figures Appear			

Examiner	Cite	NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS	
Initials	No.1	the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s), volume-issue	T
	C1	1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL U.S. District Court for the South - Distr	$\dagger$
	C2	Monsanto Co., 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana	H
	C3	Mycogen's Reply to Monsanto's Counterclaims, as filed in Mycogen Corp. v. Monsanto Co.,	H
	C4	Corp. v. Monsanto Co., 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern District	
	C5	Monsanto's Response to Mycogen's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-14), as filed in Mycogen Corp. v. Monsanto Co., 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana (Indianapolis).	
	C6	Monsanto's Expert Report of John T. Goolkasian, as filed in Mycogen Corp. v. Monsanto Co.,	
		1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the South an District Court for the South and Distric	_
		1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern Dis	
		Monsanto Co., 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana (Indianapolis).	
	(	Mycogen's Rebuttal Expert Report of Dr. Joseph Falkinham, as filed in <i>Mycogen Corp. v.</i> Monsanto Co., 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana Indianapolis).	
		Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Fischhoff's Priority of Invention, as filed Mycogen Corp. v. Monsanto Co., 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana (Indianapolis).	
	312   N	Alycogen's Opposition to Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Fischhoff's Priority of Invention, as filed in Mycogen Corp. v. Monsanto Co., 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, I.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana (Indianapolis).	-

Examiner	·	
Signature	Date	
	Considered	



s	Substitute for form 1449/PTO				Complete if Known
INIT O DATE OF THE OWNER				Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375
1	INFORMATION DISCLOSURE			Filing Date	January 30, 1992
3	STATEMENT BY APPLICANT		First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
	(Han an amount of			Art Unit	1638
	(Use as many sheets as necessary)		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
	2	Of	23	Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333

	Monsanto's Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Fischhoff's Priority of Invention, as filed in <i>Mycogen Corp. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana (Indianapolis).	Ī
C14	of invention and as to Fischhoff; Monsanto's Motions for Summary Judgment as to priority denied; Mycogen's Motion to Exclude Goolkasian testimony is granted, as filed in <i>Mycogen Corp. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 1:04-CV-0573 DFH-WTL, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana (Indianapolis).	
C15	Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	
C16	v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	
C17	Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	<b></b>
C18	Monsanto Company's Responses to Ciba-Geigy Corporation's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-6), as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	
	filed in Monsanto Company's Answers to Ciba-Geigy Corporation's Second Set of Interrogatories, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	
C20	Monsanto Company's Responses to Ciba-Geigy Corporation's Set of Extra Interrogatories to Monsanto Company, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Date	
021	Mycogen Skesponses to Mycogen's First Set of Interrogatories, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	
	Monsanto Company's Answers to Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. and Agrigenetics, Inc.'s Interrogatories 31-40, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	1
(23	Nos. 1-14), as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware	1
C24   N	First Set of Interrogatories (1-9) to MPS and Agrigenetics, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	1
C25 M fil	Monsanto's Motion For Judgment As A Matter of Law Or, In the Alternative, A New Trial, as led in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware	1
C26 N	ovartis' Motion For Judgment As A Matter of Law, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant cience, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court istrict of Delaware.	1

Fx	aminer		
	anature	Date	
91	griature	Considered	1

Substitute for form 1449/PTO			Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
			Art Unit	1638	
			Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
3 of 23		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333		

<u> </u>	28079/41333
	Mycogen and Agrigenetics Motion For Judgment As A Matter Of Law, Or Alternatively, For A Partial New Trial On Limited Issues, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
С	Novartis' Opening Brief in Support of Its Renewed Motion for Judgment As A Matter of Law, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy</i>
	Alternative, A New Trial, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
C3	Mycogen and Agrigenetics' Brief in Support of Their Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law or Alternatively, for a Partial New Trial on Limited Issues, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States
C3	Monsanto's Opposition to Defendant's Motions for Judgment As A Matter of Law, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware
C32	Novartis' Answering Brief in Opposition to Monsanto's Motion for Judgment As A Matter of Law or, In The Alternative, A New Trial, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
C33	The Alternative, A New Trial, as filed in <i>Monsanto s Motion</i> for Judgment As A Matter Of Law Or, In <i>Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
C34	Alternatively, A Partial New Trial on Limited Issues, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court
C35	filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy  Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delayers
C36	Alternative, A New Trial, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	Hearing Transcript of 7/17/96 Hearing on Pending Motions, pages 1-3 and 44-61, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	Ciba-Geigy's Motion and Notice for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. §102(g), as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
C39	Monsanto's Opposition to Ciba's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Prior Inventorship Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(g), as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	1

Substitute for form 1449/PTO		Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT  (Use as many sheets as necessary)			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton
			Art Unit	1638
4 Of 23		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333	

 	280/9/41333
	Ciba's Reply Brief in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of the '365 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(g)a, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C4	11 4/2/98 Letter Shaw to Dalleo Transmitting Mycogen's Corrected Brief in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment that the '365 Patent is Invalid Under U.S.C. § 103 (Obviousness), as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court Picture, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy
C4	Mycogen's Motion and Brief for Summary Judgment That the '365 Patent is Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. §103 (OBVIOUSNESS), as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C43	Monsanto's Answering Brief to Mycogen's Motion for Summary Judgment That the '365 Patent is Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Obviousness), as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant District of Delaware
 C44	Mycogen's Reply Brief in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment that the '365 Patent is Invalid, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-
	Support Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) for Dismissal on the Basis of Monsanto's Failure to Comply Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United
	Defendants Mycogen & Agrigenetics Brief in Support of its Motion Pursuant to rule 12(b)(6) for Dismissal on the Basis of Monsanto's Failure to Comply with the Written Description Requirement of 35 USC § 112, ¶ 1 (Corrected), as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court
C47	Errata Sheet for Defendants' Mycogen Plant Science and Agrigenetics Brief in Support of its Motion Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) for Dismissal on the Basis of Monsanto's Failure to Comply with the Written Description Requirement of 35 USC § 112, ¶ 1, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. States Court District of Delaware
C48   4   C   V   S	Plaintiff Monsanto's Brief in Opposition to Defendants Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. and Agrigenetics, Inc.'s Motion Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) Fed. R. Civ. P. for Dismissal Based on Compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 (Written Description Requirement), as filed in Monsanto Co. States Court District of Delaware
C49   D	befendant Mycogen's Reply Brief in Support of Its Motion Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), Fed. R. escription Requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant cience, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	

PTO/SB/08b (10-08)

Approved for use through 11/30/2008 OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number

Substitute for form 1449/PTO		Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT		First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
(Use as mai	ny sheets as nec	eeeanu)	Art Unit	1638
		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
5 Of 23		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333	

		28079/41333	
	C5	Comply With the Written Description Requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, as filed in Monsanto Co. V. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware	
	C5	1 Ciba-Geigy's Motion and Notice for Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Lack of Written Description under 35 U.S.C. §112, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of	ł
		Mycogen's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of the '365 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (Inadequate Written Description), as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of	ŀ
		Plaintiff Monsanto's Combined Brief in Opposition to Defendants Mycogen and Ciba's Motions for Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Lack of Adequate Written Description Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Count Distinct, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-	
	255	Patent for Lack of Written Description Under 35 U.S.C § 112, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. States Court District of Delaware	
		Ciba's Reply Brief to Monsanto's Combined Brief in Opposition to Mycogen's and Ciba's Motions for Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Lack of Written Description Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	
		Part, Denying Plaintiff's Motion For Judgment as a Matter of Law in Pending Plaintiff's Motion For Judgment as a Matter of Law in Part, and Denying Other AGRIGENETICS, INC., AND CIBA-GEIGY CORP., 96-133-RRM, UNITED STATES COURT	
C5	57	Judgment In Favor Of Defendants, AS FILED IN MONSANTO CO. V. MYCOGEN PLANT SCIENCE, INC., AGRIGENETICS, INC., AND CIBA-GEIGY CORP., 96-133-RRM, UNITED	••••
C5	0 0	onduct, 61 F. Supp. 2d 133 (D.Del. 1999) in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of	
C59	1.	levised Opinion On Post Trial Motions And Motion On Inequitable Conduct, as filed in flower formation of the following states and the following states are control of the following states and the following states are control of the following states and the following states are control of the following states are contr	
C60	A	grigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of	1
C61	19	ial Transcript, Opening Statement by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 63-84, dated June 15, 198, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Cibality Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	1

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	

Substitute for form 1449/PTO			Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT		First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton		
(Use as many sheets as necessary)			Art Unit	1638	
(out as many sneets as necessary)		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik		
6 Of 23		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333		

	<ul> <li>Trial Transcript, Opening Statement by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 122-136, dated June 15, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.</li> <li>Trial Transcript, Opening Statement by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 122-136, dated June 15, Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.</li> </ul>
	dated June 15, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics</i> , <i>Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> 96-133-RRM United States Co. 1814
	June 15, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Res.
	195, dated June 15, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	Trial Transcript, Stephen Rogers, Continued Direct examination by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 217-234, dated June 16, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
Ce	dated June 16, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics,</i> Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court Processing Court Proc
	pages 244-253, dated June 16, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C6	255, dated June 16, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C70	as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy  Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
C71	372, 375-399, dated June 16, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C72	Trial Transcript, John Goolkasian, Cross examination by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 399-400, lnc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
C73	(Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 401-422, dated June 16, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United
C74	Trial Transcript, John Goolkasian, Redirect examination by Ms. Knoll (Monsanto), pages 422-423, dated June 16, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of

	Examiner		
	Signature	Date	
•	<u> </u>	Considered	

Substitute for form 1449/PTO				Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375		
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992		
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton		
(Use as n	nany sheets	as necessary)	Art Unit	1638		
- Increased by		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik			
/ Of 23		Attorney Docket Number				

		280/9/41333
	C75	Trial Transcript, John Goolkasian Transition at the
		Trial Transcript, John Goolkasian Transition statements, pages 423-425, dated June 16, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
		436, 440-472, dated June 16, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	C77	Trial Transcript, Dr. Nam-Hai Chua, Cross examination by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 472-486, dated June 16, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
		Trial Transcript, Dr. Nam-Hai Chua. Continued Cross examination by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 503-538, dated June 17, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	79   1   p   A   C	rial Transcript, Dr. Nam-Hai Chua, Cross examination by Mr. Olson (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 538-570, dated June 17, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc.</i> , pagrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
·C	In	rial Transcript, Dr. Nam-Hai Chua, Redirect examination by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 70-581, 594-605, dated June 17, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science</i> , elaware.
C8	G	rial Transcript, Dr. Nam-Hai Chua Transition Statements, pages 605-606, dated June 17, 298, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Cibaergy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
C8	19 <i>Ge</i>	98, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-
C8:	da:	ted June 18, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics</i> ,
	dat Inc	ed June 18, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics,
C85	109 Agr Dela	11, dated June 18, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C86	Tria 199 Geig	I Transcript, Deposition Testimony of Michael Miller, pages 1102-1110, dated June 19, 8, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Cibagy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District, Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-
C87	1998	Transcript, Deposition Testimony of Sandra Cannon, pages 1110-1123, dated June 19, 3, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Cibaty Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	1
		1

Substitute for form 1449/PTO			Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
(Use as ma	(Use as many sheets as necessary)			1638	
siretis as necessary)		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik		
8 Of 23		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333		

	20019/41333
	C88 Trial Transcript, Transition Statements regarding Michael Miller and Sandra Cannon, pages 1125, dated June 19, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	C89 Trial Transcript, Deposition Testimony of Fred Perlak, pages 1125-1137, dated June 19, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy</i>
	1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court Planting (Part of Part of Par
	1155, dated June 19, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	92 Trial Transcript, Dr. Julia Bailey-Serres, Direct examination by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 1161-1219, 1223-1238, 1250-1260, dated June 19, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States
C	Trial Transcript, Dr. Julia Bailey-Serres, Cross examination by Mr. Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 1260-1286, dated June 19, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science</i> , Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
Cs	Trial Transcript, Dr. Julia Bailey-Serres, Redirect examination by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 1289-1292, dated June 19, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C9	as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy  Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of D. I., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy
C96	pages 1392-1405, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen/Agrigenetics</i> ), <i>Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C97	1413, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C98	Trial Transcript, Guy Cardineau, Redirect examination and transition statement by Mr. Guise (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 1413-1418, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. States Court District of Delaware
C99	Trial Transcript, Michel Adang, Direct examination by Mr. Mahaney (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 1418-1453, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science</i> , Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	

Substitute for form 1449/PTO			Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
CTATEMEN	ION DISC	LOSURE	Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT  (Use as many sheets as necessary)			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
			Art Unit	1638	
9 Of 23		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik		
		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333		

	1
	Trial Transcript, Michel Adang, Cross examination by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 1453–1487, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	101 Trial Transcript, Michel Adang, Redirect examination by Mr. Mahaney (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 1487-1492, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	O2 Trial Transcript, Gerald Bjorge, Direct examination by Mr. Olson (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 1497-1514, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	Trial Transcript, Gerald Bjorge, Cross examination by Ms. Knoll (Monsanto), pages 1514- 1531, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	Trial Transcript, Gerald Bjorge, Redirect examination and transition statement by Mr. Olson (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 1532-1536, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	Trial Transcript, Deposition Testimony of Lawrence Lavin, pages 1537-1538, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	pages 1539-1604, dated June 24, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	7 Trial Transcript, Joseph Falkinham, Cross examination by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 1655, 1666-1696, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	Trial Transcript, Joseph Falkinham, Redirect examination and transition statement by Mr. Olson (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 1696-1707, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	Trial Transcript, Deposition Testimony of Dr. Nam-Hai Chua and transition statements, pages 1707-1708, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	Trial Transcript, Fred Perlak, Rebuttal Direct examination by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 1712-1773, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
C111	Trial Transcript, Fred Perlak, Cross examination by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 1773-1821, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	

Substitute for form 1449/PTO			Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
			Art Unit	1638	
(555 55 many sheets as necessary)		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik		
10 Of 23		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333		

		28079/41333
	C11	Trial Transcript, Fred Perlak, Cross examination by Mr. Olson (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 1821-1841, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Com. 96,133 RPM Units Agriculture (Mycogen Plant Science, Inc.,
	C112	Delaware.
		Trial Transcript, Fred Perlak, Redirect examination by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 1842-1843, and transition statement by Mr. Olson (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 1843-1844 dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	C114	dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics</i> , <i>Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> 96-133-RPM United States Co. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17. 17
		June 25, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc.,
		pages 1855-1860, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	1.	Trial Transcript, Harry Klee, Direct examination by Mr. Lee (Monsanto), pages 1867-1874, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
		dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics</i> ,
	F   //	pages 1875-1878, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, onc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	A D	rial Transcript, Linda Hanley Bowdoin, Direct examination by Mr. Lee (Monsanto), pages 880-1885, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., grigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	A D	rial Transcript, Linda Hanley Bowdoin, Cross examination by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 885-1887, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., grigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	In	rial Transcript, Tom Rogers, Direct examination by Ms. Knoll (Monsanto), pages 1887-1894, atted June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	da Inc	ted June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics</i> ,
C12	da	ral Transcript, Toni Armstrong, Direct examination by Mr. Lee (Monsanto), pages 1897-1902, ted June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
[-3.3.3.3]	Considered	1

Substitute for form 1449/PTO				Complete if Known		
INIEO	DAAATI	ON DIGG		Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
			CLOSURE	Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT				First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
	(Use as man	v sheets as noc	'Accamul	Art Unit	1638	
1	(Use as many sheets as necessary)			Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
11 Of 23		Attorney Docket Number				

	280/9/41333
	C125 Trial Transcript Toni Ametrone Communication
	Trial Transcript, Toni Armstrong, Cross examination by Mr. Oelke (Novartis), pages 1902-1903, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	Trial Transcript, Toni Armstrong, Cross examination by Mr. Dickerson (Mycogen/Agrigenetics) page 1903, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	127 Trial Transcript, Jeanne Layton, Direct examination by Mr. Lee (Monsanto), pages 1904-1912, dated June 25, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	June 25, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycopen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Com. 96-133-RPM United State
	1963, dated June 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	Trial Transcript, David Fishhoff, Cross examination by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 1963-2018, dated June 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics</i> , Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	pages 2018-2044, dated June 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science</i> , Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C13	Trial Transcript, David Fishhoff, Redirect examination by Ms. Knoll (Monsanto), pages 2045-2046, dated June 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C13	(Novartis), pages 2047-2051, dated June 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant District of Delaware.</i>
	Trial Transcript, Deposition transcript of Walter Wright, pages 2051-2056, dated June 26, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	2071, dated June 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C136	Trial Transcript, Dr. Nam-Hai Chua, Cross examination by Mr. Olson (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 2087-2096, dated June 26. 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science</i> , <i>Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	1

Substitute for form 1449/PTO				Complete if Known		
INFORMA	TION	DICO		Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
INFORMA	NTON	DISC	LOSURE	Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT				First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
(Use as n	nany sheet	S as nece	ssan/i	Art Unit	1638	
(Use as many sheets as necessary)				Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
12 Of 23		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333			

	280/9/41333
(	C137 Trial Transcript, Opening Statement by Mr. Drivas (Novartis) on inequitable conduct, pages 2209-2227, dated June 26, 1998, as filed in Monsento Co. 11 March 1998.
	Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	Trial Transcript, Opening Statement by Mr. Tomasch (Mycogen/Agrigenetics) on inequitable conduct, pages 2228-2253, dated June 26, 1998, as filed in Management 20, 19
	Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court
10	139 Trial Transcript, Closing Argument by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 2277-2319, dated June 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science</i> 2
	Ciba-Geigy Corp. 96-133-RRM United States Carrier Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and
	1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-
C1	
	Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Com. 96, 133 PDM Ltd. Wycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics
01	42 Trial Transcript, Rebuttal Argument by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 2414-2421, dated June 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science</i> , Jan. 1
	Ciba-Geigy Corp. 96-133-RRM United States Collette, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and
	1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Afrecess Olympia (Novartis), pages 2421-2422, dated June 29
C14	4 Trial Transcript, Rebuttal Argument by A. Source District of Delaware.
	Trial Transcript, Rebuttal Argument by Mr. Olson (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages 2422-2424, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.  5 Trial Transcript, Opening Statement by Mr. Olson (Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	2432-2446, dated June 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C146	Trial Transcript Lawrence Rogered Disease
	Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United
	Trial Transcript, Lawrence Bogorad, Cross examination by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 2493-2505, dated June 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
C148	Trial Transcript, Lawrence Bogorad, Redirect examination by Mr. Tomasch
	States Court District of Delaware
C149	Trial Transcript, David Fishhoff, Examination by Mr. Tomasch (Mycogen/Agrigenetics), pages
	2509-2547, dated June 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	1

Substitute for form 1449/	PTO		Complete if Known		
INFORMAT	ION DIO	21	Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
INFORMATI	ION DISC	LOSURE	Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
STATEMEN	II BY AP	PLICANT	First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
(Use as man	IV Sheets as no	*Accord	Art Unit	1638	
(Use as many sheets as necessary)			Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
13 Of 23		Attorney Docket Number			

	2007 9/4 1333
(	C150 Trial Transcript, David Fishhoff, Continued examination by Mr. Tomasch
	Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United
	151 Trial Transcript, David Fishhoff, Examination by Mr. Drivas (Novartis), pages 2614-2645, dated July 8, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	dated July 8, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics.
	conduct, pages 2658-2686, dated July 8, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court
	54 Trial Transcript, Closing argument by Mr. Drivas (Novartis) on inequitable conduct, pages 2691-2699, dated July 8, 1998, as filed in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	Trial Transcript, Closing argument by Mr. Lynch (Monsanto), pages 2699-2708, dated July 8, 1998, as filed in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court
1	7 Expert report of Arthur Aronson, submitted 3/25/98 in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court
	B Expert report of Julia Bailey-Serres , submitted 3/25/98 in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court
	Expert report of Gerald Bjorge, submitted 3/25/98 in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
	Expert report of Gerald Bjorge, submitted 4/15/98 in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of
	Expert report of Lawrence Bogorad, submitted 3/25/98 in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court
	Expert report of John Dewhirst, submitted 3/25/98 in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.
C163	Expert report of Joseph Falkinham, submitted 4/15/98 in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	

Substitute for for	m 1449/PTO			Complete if Known		
INFOR	4 A TIO			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
			SCLOSURE	Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
SIAIE	MENT	BY A	PPLICANT	First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
(Use	as many sh	eete se	necessari)	Art Unit	1638	
(Use as many sheets as necessary)			mecessary)	Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
14 Of 23		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333			

		28079/41333	
	C16	34 Expert report of Jacob 5 Hill	
		Expert report of Joseph Falkinham, submitted 3/25/98 in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	
	C16	Expert report of Joseph Falkinham, submitted 4/30/98 in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	_
	C16	District of Delaware.  6 Expert report of John Coefficients and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court	
		6 Expert report of John Goolkasian, submitted 3/25/98 in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	
		7 Expert report of John Goolkasian, submitted 4/15/98 in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp., 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	ł
	C168	Expert report of Julia Bailey-Serres, submitted 4/15/98 in Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant	+
	C169	Expert report of Nam-Hai Chua, submitted 4/15/00	L
		Delaware.	
		Expert report of Nam-Hai Chua, submitted 3/25/98 in <i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc., Agrigenetics, Inc., and Ciba-Geigy Corp.</i> , 96-133-RRM, United States Court District of Delaware.	r
		Monsanto's Responses to Mycogen's First Set of Interrogatories, dated July 10, 1995, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company</i> , 95-CV-653, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California (San Diego).	
	172	Monsanto's Responses to Plaintiffs' Fourth Set of Interrogatories, dated January 21, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company</i> , 95-CV-653, U.S. District Court, Southern	
С	173	Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. and Agrigenetics, Inc.'s Responses to Monsanto's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-11), dated June 24, 1997, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto	*****
	c C a C	of Points and Authorities in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment of Validity and Memorandum Declaration of Laurenson in Support), dated December 28, 1995, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et Diego).	
C1	9	Mycogen's Statement of Undisputed Facts in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment of Validity, dated December 28, 1995, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, 5-CV-653, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California (San Diego).	
	V. M	falidity and Exhibits in Support, filed July 24, 1996, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v.</i> filego).	M.Mae
C17	77 M 19 Sc	ycogen's Reply in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment of Validity, dated August 5, 996, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , 95-CV-653, U.S. District Court, buthern District of California (San Diego).	CHARLES

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	

substitute for form 1449/PTO			Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
			Art Unit	1638	
			Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
15	Of	23	Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333	

	28079741333
C	178 Order Denving Motion for Summan, Judgment Charles
	178 Order Denying Motion for Summary Judgment of Validity; Denying Motion for Summary Judgment Re Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(g); Granting Motion for Summary Judgment on Claim Construction, filed August 15, 1996, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, 95-CV-653, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California (San Diego).
	§ 102(g) and § 103 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56, dated March 30, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen California</i> (San Diego)
	Mycogen's and Agrigenetics's Opposition to Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(g) and § 103 (includes Declaration of F.T. Alexandra Mahaney and Appendix, dated April 13, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, 95-CV-653, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California (San Diego).
	U.S.C. § 102(g) and § 103, dated April 20, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto
	U.S. Patent No. 5,380,831 (includes Declaration of Melinda Patterson), dated March 30, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , 95-CV-653, U.S. District Court.
	Mycogen's Opposition to Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of Claims 1- 12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,380,831 (includes Declaration of F.T. Alexandra Mahaney and Appendix), dated April 13, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company</i> , 95- Reply Memorandum in Supposition of California (San Diego).
C184	Claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,380,831, dated April 20, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et Diego).
C185	Order Lifting Stay; Order Granting Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(g) and 103; Order Denying Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as Moot, filed November 10, 1999, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v.</i> Diego).
	Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, 252 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2001) – Inter alia, reversing summary judgment of invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)
C187	Supplemental Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of Claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,380,831, filed November 19, 2001, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, 95-CV-653, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California (San Diseas)
C188	Mycogen's Opposition to Monsanto's Motion on Remand for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Of Claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,380,831, dated December 3, 2001, as filed in Mycogen California (San Diego)
C189 F	Reply Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of Claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,380,831, dated December 10, 2001, is filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company</i> , 95-CV-653, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California (San Diego).

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	1

Substitute for form 1449/	РТО			Complete if Known
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton
			Art Unit	1638
(555 55 many sneeds as necessary)		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
16	Of	23	Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333

		Attorney Docket Number   28079/41333
	C19	Order Denying Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment, dated June 4, 2002, as filed in
		of California (San Diego)
à-		Rule 26 Expert Report of John T. Goolkasian, dated November 13, 2003, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, 95-CV-653, U.S. District Court, Southern District of
	C192	2 Rule 26 Expert Report of Dallas E. Johnson, dated November 13, 2003, as filed in Mycogen
	C193	Expert Report of Dr. Josephin Mossing, dated N
		(San Diego).
	C194	Rebuttal Expert Report of Joseph Falkinham III, dated December 18, 2003, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company</i> , 95-CV-653, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California (San Diego).
- 1	C195	Notice of DeKalb Pursuant to 35 LL C. C. S. 200 L. L. L. L. L. C. S. 200 L. L. L. C. S. 200 L.
		Notice of DeKalb Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 282, dated December 12, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of
	C196	Notice Under 35 U.S.C. § 282 by Monsanto and Delta and Pine Land Company, dated December 20, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delawers (Allieries)
C	197	Mycogen's Supplemental Responses to the belaware (Wilmington).
	- 1	Company, et al. 1:96-cy-00505 PRA LLC Distribution Plant, et al. v. Monsanto
1	ļi	in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court.
	199   I	Mycogen's Supplemental Response to Monsanto's First Set of Interrogatories, dated December 23, 1997, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-
C2	2	Monsanto's Responses to Mycogen's and Agrigenetics' First Set of Interrogatories, dated April 23, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C2	201 N	Monsanto's and Delta and Pine Land's Supplemental Responses to Interrogatories, dated
C2	02 D	selta and Pine Land's Responses to Mycogen Bland and Agrigenetics' First Set of Interrogatories,
C20	03 M 50	ycogen's and Agrigenetics' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law Under Fed. R. Civ. P.
C20	04 My	96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).  ycogen's and Agrigenetics' Post-Trial Brief in Support of Motion for Judgment as a Matter of ant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of elaware (Wilmington).

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	I

PTO/SB/08b (10-08)

Approved for use through 11/30/2008 OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number

ubstitute for form 1449/PTO			Complete if Known		
INFORMATI	ON DIC	21.00115-	Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT  (Use as many sheets as necessary)			Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
			Art Unit	1638	
17			Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
	Of	23	Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333	

	Attorney Docket Number 28079/41333
C	205 Monsanto's and Delta and Pine Land's Opposition to Mycogen's Motion for Judgment as a  Matter of Law Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 50 (includes Appendix in Support)
	Company et al. 1:96 cv. 00505 PD1 1:1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsonto
C.	of Law, dated April 27, 1009 and the product to Flamilli S Motion for Judgment as a Motion
i	7.96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
	1 30-CV-00505-RRM 11 S Diaming O
C2	Monsanto's and Delta and Pine Land's Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law at
	De Monsanto's and Delta and Binary (U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)
	the Verdict, dated February 20, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company
C21	Judgment as a Matter of Land's and Delta and Pine Land's Renewed Motions for
C21	(Wilmington)
021	Defendants' Reply to Plaintiffs' Opposition to Monsanto's and Delta and Pine Land's Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law, dated May 12, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v.</i> (Wilmington).
C212	Letter from Balick Ashby & Codds
	(Wilmington) (Wilmington) (Wilmington)
	Letter from Ingersoll to Judge McKelvie re Mycogen's Replying on Banner Deposition for Summary Judgment Argument, dated January 6, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. (Wilmington)
C214	Monsanto's and Delta and Pine Land's Brief in Support of Their Motion for Support
	Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al., 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court
C215	Plaintiffs' Brief in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Under Company, et al., 196-cy, 00505, PDM, 412, 1997, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al., v. Monsanto
C216	Amended Version of Plaintiffs' Brief in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary
	District of Delaware (Wilmington)
C21/ F	Reply Brief of Monsanto and Delta and Pine Land in Support of Their Motion for Summary udgment of Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(g), dated January 7, 1998, as filed in Mycogen relaware (Wilmington).
ner	t source of

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	

PTO/SB/08b (10-08)

Approved for use through 11/30/2008 OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Substitute for form 1449/PTO			Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT  (Use as many sheets as necessary)			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
			Art Unit	1638	
			Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
18	Of	23	Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333	

		Monsanto's and Delta and Pine Land's Brief in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of Patent Nos. 5,567,600 and 5,567,862 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, dated October 27, District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
		Plaintiffs' Answering Brief to Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of Patent Nos. 5,567,600 and 5,567,862 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, dated November 24, 1997, as filed in District of Delaware (Wilmington)
	C2	Declaration of Dr. Guy Cardineau in Support of Plaintiffs' Answering Brief to Monsanto's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, dated November 24, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S.
	C2	21 Monsanto's and Delta and Pine Land's Reply to Mycogen's Answer to Monsanto's Brief in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, dated 00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of D. W. Monsanto Company, et al., 1:96-cv-
		Invalidity (includes Appendix), dated October 13, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v.</i> (Wilmington),
	C22	dated November 18, 1997, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al. 1.96
		Summary Judgment of Invalidity, dated November 18, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. (Wilmington).
	C225	(includes Appendix), dated December 11, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto
		al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Milmin Annual Company, et
		Conduct, dated September 8, 1999, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et
***************************************		Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware
		Dallas Johnson Expert Report, dated November 3, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v.</i> (Wilmington).
	1.0	Joachim Messing Expert Report, dated November 3, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Wilmington).
	C231 [	Lawrence Bogorad Expert Report, dated November 14, 1997, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al.</i> Wilmington).  Wilmington).
miner		Data



Substitute for form 1449/PTO			Complete if Known		
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT  (Use as many sheets as necessary)			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375	
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992	
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton	
			Art Unit	1638	
the state of the s		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik		
19	Of	23	Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333	

C23	2 Joseph O. Falkinham Rebuttal Report, dated Name in Control	
	2 Joseph O. Falkinham Rebuttal Report, dated November 24, 1997, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).	T
C23	Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co., 243 F.3d 1316 (2001).	+
- L C22		
	Trial Transcript, Opening Statement by Mr. Olson, pages 80-96, 101-118, dated January 20, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).	$\dagger$
	frial Franscript, Opening Statement by Mr. Lynch, pages 118-152, dated January 20, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)	-
	Trial Transcript, Opening Statement by Mr. Baumgartner, pages 154-193, dated January 20, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)	$\vdash$
	January 21, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al</i> , 1:96-cv-	
	504, dated January 22, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of D.	
	January 22, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , et al., 1:96-cv-	
	dated January 22, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-	
2	22, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM.	
	anuary 23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , et al, 1:96-cv-	$\dashv$
	anuary 23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al. 1:96-cv-	$\dashv$
1! D	998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al,</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S.	$\dashv$
Ja   Ja   OC	nuary 23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-	$\exists$
Ja	ial Transcript. Sylvia McPherson, Cross-Examination by Mr. Olson, pages 984-987, dated nuary 23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).	1

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	
		4

Substitute for form 1449/PTO				Complete if Known
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT  (Use as many sheets as necessary)			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton
			Art Unit	1638
		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
20 Of 23			28079/41333	

T	C247 Trial Transcript, Sylvia McPhomos, D. II
	Trial Transcript, Sylvia McPherson, Redirect by Mr. Lee, pages 987-988, dated January 23, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company et al. v.
-	1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)
	District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
1	Trial Transcript, Harry J. Klee, Direct Examination by Ms. Knoll, pages 989-996, dated Januar 23, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company
1	23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)
	U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
10	249 I rial I ranscript Harry I Klee Cross Fire-in-it
- 1	January 23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C	
1	23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)
	U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C	251 Trial Transcript Roy Fuebo Commission).
1	Trial Transcript, Roy Fuchs, Cross-Examination by Mr. Olson, pages 1012-1016, dated  January 23, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al., v. March 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al., v. Mycogen Plant, et al.
	January 23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-
C	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
102	
	dated January 23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
1 02	
1	January 23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C25	
1	dated January 23, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant at all y Mr. Lynch, pages 1025-1042,
	dated January 23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-
C25	5 Trial Transcript Stephen G. Rogers Co. Sciaware (Willington).
	dated January 23, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of District o
C25	6 Trial Transcript David Fischhoff Disease (Williamston).
1	January 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al</i> , 1:96-cv-
1	00505-RRM 11.S. District Court Distr
C25	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
525	
	January 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-
Care	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C256	
1	1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S.
	District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C259	I fill I ranscript I loachim Messing Disease
	January 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al., 1:96-cv-
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delayers, Molisanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-
C260	Trial Transcript Josephy Massing Cross of Belaware (Wilmington).
	January 26, 1998, as filed in Mycogn Pleas at at a table of the Plantage of th
	January 26. 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , et al, 1:96-cv-
C261	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
	1272, dated January 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
	TOUCH TOUCH TIME IT A LITERATOR COLOR DISEASE AND COMPANY, EL M.

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	1

Substitute for form 1449/PTO				Complete if Known
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton
(Use as mar	(Use as many sheets as necessary)			1638
		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
21	Of	23	Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333

	Trial Transcript, Catherine Mackey, Cross-Examination by Mr. Olson, pages 1273-1292, date January 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Managets Co.
	January 26, 1998, as filed in Mycogon Plantamination by Mr. Olson, pages 1273-1292, date
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delever Worksanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-
	Trial Transcript, Catherine Mackey, Redirect by Mr. Baumgartner, pages 1292-1294, dated  January 26, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monagett 9
	January 26, 1998, as filed in Adverse Redirect by Mr. Baumgartner, pages 1292-1294, dated
	January 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
- 1	January 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al., 1:96-cv-
+	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
-	
1	dated January 26, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)
+ 6	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
0.	
	1342-1344, dated January 27, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delevant Atti
	et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
Ca	Trial Transcript, Daniel R. Gallie, Direct by Mr. Baumgartner, pages 1359-1402, 1410-1435, dated January 27, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al., v. Mr.
1	dated January 27, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C2	
	January 27, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C2	
i	January 27, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C27	
1	27, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM,
	U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C27	1   I   I   I   I   I   I   I   I   I
1	27, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM,
	U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C27	Citial Hanscript Deposition Testiment for Ti
	January 27, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C27	
	dated January 28, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant at all in Mycogen Plant at all in the second secon
	dated January 28, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-
C274	Trial Transcript, Joseph O. Falkinham Co., Schware (Williamigton).
	Trial Transcript, Joseph O. Falkinham, Cross-Examination by Mr. Lynch, pages 1654-1690, dated January 28, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
	00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-
C275	Trial Transcript Joseph O. Falkinham Co. Scientific (Wilmington).
	1691, dated January 28, 1998, as filed in the samination by Mr. Baumgartner, pages 1690-
	1691, dated January 28, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al., 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court. District of Delayers (AV)
C276	1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
02.0	
1	January 28, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	

Substitute for form 1449/PTO				Complete if Known
INICODMATI	ON 010	01.00	Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375
INFORMATI			Filing Date	January 30, 1992
STATEMENT BY APPLICANT  (Use as many sheets as necessary)			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton
			Art Unit	1638
			Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik
22	22 Of 23		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333

C	277 Trial Transcript Michael I. Adaps. Direct Francis di
	<ul> <li>Trial Transcript, Michael J. Adang, Direct Examination by Ms. Mahaney, pages 1701-1744, 1747-1750, dated January 28, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company</i>, et al., 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).</li> <li>Trial Transcript, Michael J. Adams.</li> </ul>
C2	278 Trial Transcript, Michael J. Adang, Cross-Examination by Mr. Lynch, pages 1750-1778, dated January 28, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-79 Trial Transcript Michael J. Spirit Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).
C2	79 Trial Transcript, Michael J. Adang, Cross-Examination by Mr. Baumgartner, pages 1778-1813, dated January 28, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant of the Landscript of the Lands
C28	Trial Transcript, Michael J. Adang, Redirect by Ms. January 28, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Ms. Pages 1813-1820, dated
C28	Trial Transcript, Deposition Testimony of John Ingle, pages 1833-1840, dated January 28, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S.
	Trial Transcript, Jean Romero-Severson, Direct Examination by Ms. Mahaney, pages 1841-1847, dated January 28, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al., 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Date.
	dated January 28, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-
	1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S.
	January 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al., 1:96-cv-
	2013, dated January 19, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al., 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court. District of Palers.
C287	dated January 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , et al. 1:96-cv-
	1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S.
C289	Trial Transcript, Deposition Testimony of Charles Armstrong, pages 2063-2074, dated January 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)
C290	Trial Transcript, Deposition Testimony of Ben Bowen, pages 2074-2094, dated January 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al,</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)
C291	Trial Transcript, Deposition Testimony of William Gurley, pages 2132-2141, dated January 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al,</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).

Examiner		
Signature	Date	
	Considered	

PTO/SB/08b (10-08)

Approved for use through 11/30-2008 OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Substitute for form 1449/PTO				Complete if Known
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT  (Use as many sheets as necessary)			Application Number	07/827,906-Conf. #3375
			Filing Date	January 30, 1992
			First Named Inventor	Kenneth A. Barton
			Art Unit	1638
		Examiner Name	A. R. Kubelik	
23	23 Of 23		Attorney Docket Number	28079/41333

	C2	72 Trial Transcript, Deposition Testimony of Lorance Greenlee, pages 2192-2194, dated January 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al.</i> , <i>y. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 4.20					
		29. 1998 as filed in Mycography of Lorance Greenlee, pages 2192-2194, dated January					
	1	29, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)					
	C29	U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).					
		Trial Transcript, Deposition Testimony of Larry Swaney, pages 2194-2196, dated January 29, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al. 1998, 2008-2009.					
	1	1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)					
······································	C20	District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).					
	CZS	Trial Transcript, Deposition Testimony of Kevin McBride, pages 2254-2257, dated January 30, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1,000, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1,000, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1,000, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1,000, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1,000, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1,000, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1,000, 1998, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1,000, 1998,					
		1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)					
	C20	District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).					
	C29	21 Mai Manscript Deposition Tooting - 4.0 % -					
	1	1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)					
	000	District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).					
	C296	Olifial Iranscript Deposition Tootimes - Col					
	1	1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)					
		District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).					
1	C297	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I					
- 1	1	30, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al</i> , 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington)					
-		U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).					
	C298	I I I d I I d I SCODI I Deposition Tootimes (D					
- 1		1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Compages 2264-2273, dated January 30,					
		District Court, District of Delaware ANIII-1-100 Company, et al., 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S.					
- 1	C299	Trial Transcript Deposition Testings (2)					
- 1		dated January 30, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , et al. 1:96-cv-					
		00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Date of the Workship Company, et al. 1:96-cv-					
- 1	C300	Trial Transcript Closing Agrument by At. Co.					
		30, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen Plant et al. v. Monaget Communication (1998), as filed in Mycogen (1998),					
	- 1	J.S. District Court, District of Dolowers (All)					
(	C301	Trial Transcript Closing Argument by Marington).					
- 1	1:	as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant</i> , et al. v. <i>Monsanto Company</i> , et al., 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S.					
i	11	District Court District of Dolowers Additional District Of Dolowers District Di					
	C302	Trial Transcript Closing Argument by Ma.					
- 1	11	998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al., Meaning after, pages 2479-2522, dated January 30					
	1 L	District Court, District of Delaware Avilles - A. J. 90-cv-00505-RRM U.S.					
C	303   1	rial Transcript Closing Argument by M. G.					
	3	0, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant of Mr. Olson (Continued), pages 2522-2528, dated January					
- 1	10	LS. District Court, District of Dolowers, Additional Company, et al., 1:96-cv-00505-RRM					
С	304 T	rial Transcript, Closing Argument by Mr. Baumgartner (Continued), pages 2528-2530, dated anuary 30, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Communications and the continued of the c					
		anuary 30, 1998, or field is Argument by Mr. Baumgartner (Continued), pages 2528-2530, dated					
- 1	0	anuary 30, 1998, as filed in <i>Mycogen Plant, et al. v. Monsanto Company, et al.</i> , 1:96-cv-					
C	305 P	0505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware (Wilmington).					
10.							
1	AA	idgment as a Matter of Law, dated April 27, 1998, as filed in Mycogen Plant, et al. v.					
i	IVI	onsanto Company, et al, 1:96-cv-00505-RRM, U.S. District Court, District of Delaware					
1	/\/	(Iminaton)					

<sup>\*</sup>EXAMINER. Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Examiner	- English language	ranslation is attached
Signature	Date	
	Considered	

Applicant's unique citation designation number (optional). Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language Translation is attached

# **EXHIBIT B**



### United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 14-50 Alexandria Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

Al	PELICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	07/827,906	01/30/1992	KENNETH A. BARTON	28079/41333	3375
	74002 Marchall Gere	7590 02 13/20 stein & Borun LLP (Mc	EXAMINER		
	6300 Sears To	· ·	KUBELIK, ANNE R		
	233 South Was Chicago, IL 60			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	Cincago, 12. oc	7000	RECEIVED	1638	
			FEB 7'0 2009		
				MAII. DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			MAHSHALL GERSTEIN	02/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



#### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

FFB 1 3 2009

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP (Monsanto) 6300 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive Chicago IL 60606

In re Application of:

Barton et al.

Serial No.: 07/827,906

Filed: January 30, 1992

Attorney Docket No.: 28079/41333

: PETITION DECISION

This is in response to the petition under 37 CFR § 1.59(b), filed February 10, 2009, to expunge information from the above identified application. This application has not been allowed

Petitioner requests that the Proprietary Information Disclosure Statement, February 10, 2009 be expunged from the record. Petitioner states either: (A) that the information contains trade secret material, proprietary material and/or material that is subject to a protective order which has not been made public; or (B) that the information submitted was unintentionally submitted and the failure to obtain its return would cause irreparable harm to the party who submitted the information or to the party in interest on whose behalf the information was submitted, and the information has not otherwise been made public. The petition fee set forth in 37 CFR § 1.17(g) has been paid.

This application is under non-final action. Also, the information provided has not been reviewed. As stated in M.P.E.P. 724, upon allowance or other action closing prosecution in an application, petition may be made for return of Proprietary information. The information cannot be expunged at this time.

The petition is **<u>DISMISSED</u>**. Petitioner may resubmit the petition subsequent to a Notice of Allowability or *ex parte Quayle* action being mailed in the application. No additional petition fee will be required at that time

Should there be any questions about this decision please contact Marianne C. Seidel by letter addressed to Director, TC 1600, at the address listed above, or by telephone at 571-272-0584 or by facsimile sent to the general Office facsimile number, 703-872-9306.

Marianne C. Seidel

Quality Assurance Specialist

Technology Center 1600